



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/178,396	10/23/1998	BRIAN G MORIN	2029	4444

25280 7590 08/06/2002

MILLIKEN & COMPANY  
920 MILLIKEN RD  
PO BOX 1926  
SPARTANBURG, SC 29304

EXAMINER

PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/178,396

Applicant(s)

MORIN ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher C. Pratt

Art Unit

1771

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's remarks filed 6/7/02 have been entered and carefully considered. Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive of patentability for reasons set forth herein below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui et al (5814567) in view of Zeidell (3902299), as previously set forth.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to select the fabric of Yahiaoui as a cleanroom wipe because said fabric is designed to be wettable for use as a diaper or related absorbent article. This argument is not persuasive because Yahiaoui also teaches its coated fabric to be used as a wipe (col. 2, lines 33-34).

Zeidell teaches laundering wipes to remove unwanted lint and debris. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to launder the fabric of Yahiaoui by the desire to remove lint and debris from the wipe. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to launder the fabric sufficiently to achieve applicant's claimed particle release property by the desire to further reduce the lint and debris the wipe would leave behind. This would allow the wipe to be sold to an increased number of markets because of its improved particle release property.

Art Unit: 1771

Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to launder the fabric of Yahiaoui because yahiaoui's wipe is coated. However, Yahiaoui teaches the coated fabric to be used as a wipe and Zeidell teaches laundering wipes. Applicant provides no evidence supporting the allegation that the skilled artisan would not have been motivated to launder a coated wipe.

Applicant argues that unexpected benefits of particle attraction are achieved with the use of a coated wipe. However, it is the examiner's position that particle attraction would have been an obvious benefit of a coating on a fabric because the coating composition can be modified for tackiness. Said rejection is maintained from the last action.

4. Claims 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui et al (5814567) in view of Zeidell (3902299) and Appplicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), as previously set forth.

Applicant's response relies on the arguments set forth above. Accordingly this rejection is maintained for the reasons set forth above.

### ***Conclusion***


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Pratt whose telephone number is 703-305-6559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7 am to 4 pm.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Christopher C. Pratt  
August 1, 2002



CHERYL A. JASKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER